

REMARKS

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Applicant wishes to thank the examiner for indicating the allowability of claim 14.

According to the Office Action, claims 8-12 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 4,888,798 (hereinafter "Earnest") in view of U.S. Patent 5,819,263 (hereinafter "Bromley").

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed as lacking sufficient factual support and failing to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in accordance with the established cases and statutory law.

It is respectfully submitted that pursuant to 35 USC 102(e), a person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

“(e) the invention was described in - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.”

It is respectfully submitted that Bromley was filed on July 19, 1996 with no claim for foreign priority or continuation benefit. Hence, Bromley's 102(e) date as a prior art reference is July 19, 1996.

The effective filing date of the present application, based on its earliest filed continuation application, is October 13, 1995. It is believed that Applicant's claims are fully supported by the application filed on October 13, 1995, now U.S. Patent 5,765,152. If the examiner disagrees, he is respectfully requested to present evidence to the contrary. In the absence of such evidence from the examiner, it is respectfully submitted that Bromley does not qualify as prior art under

35 USC 102(e) in the present application.

It is not clear as to why the examiner ignored the Applicant's argument filed February 21, 2006 on the deficiency of Bromley to qualify as prior art. Clarification from the examiner and his supervisor is respectfully requested.

Since the examiner conceded that Earnest fails to teach or suggest, among other things, Applicant's feature of "wherein a drag and drop function is among those that are not permitted," claim 8 is distinguishable over the prior art of record.

Claims 9-12 depend from independent claim 8, which has been shown to be allowable over the prior art references. Accordingly, claims 9-12 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as the additional subject matter recited therein. Applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of claims 9-12 has been overcome and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and claims allowed. An early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Even if, for the sake of argument, Bromley qualified as prior art in the instant application, the portion of the patent relied upon in the Office Action would be factually deficient in disclosing the above-mentioned recited feature, thereby failing to support the rejection of Applicant's claims 8-12. The portion of the Bromley patent in column 11, lines 5-25, relied upon in the Office Action, is completely silent on a drag and drop function as a not permitted usage right recited in claim 8 of the instant application.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is

earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Larry Liberchuk/
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation
914-333-9602

November 16, 2006